REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Please cancel claim 1 without prejudice. Claims 2-20 have been added and are pending in the present application.

1. 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejected claim 1 as being vague and indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. While Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, Applicant has cancelled claim 1 in lieu of pending claims 2-20.

2. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article "ePALS Classroom Exchange First to Provide Teacher Monitored Email With Instant Language Translation" (hereinafter "*EP Article*"), in view of the article "MessageLabs: British Government Takes On MessageLabs Virus Protection" (hereinafter "*ML Article*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

As noted above, claim 1 has been cancelled. Independent claims 2 and 17 are directed to methods for filtering and monitoring web browsing. Claim 2 requires defining a plurality of levels of a multi-level system, wherein at least one level comprises filtering and monitoring; establishing a hierarchy for the plurality of levels; and creating a user account associated with at least one of the plurality of levels, wherein the user account

controls filtering and monitoring applied to other user accounts associated with the levels below the at least one of the plurality of levels.

The *EP Article* does not disclose several elements set forth in claim 2, including a multi-level system. Accordingly, the *EP Article* cannot disclose a hierarchy for the multi-level system nor can it disclose the ability of each level of the system to inherit the filtering and monitoring of the levels above. The *MP Article* fails to remedy the deficiencies of the *EP Article* because it likewise does not disclose a multi-level system. Furthermore, due to the absence of a multi-level system, the *MP Article* cannot disclose a hierarchy for the multi-level system nor can it disclose the ability of each level of the system to inherit the filtering and monitoring of the levels above. Therefore, claim 2 is not obvious in view of the *EP Article,* the *MP Article*, or a combination of the two.

Claim 17 entails identifying requirements associated with content wherein at least one requirement is based on categorization of keywords so as to establish a first category of information consistent with a particular requirement of a group of users and not based on appropriateness and so as to establish a second category of information based on appropriateness, and setting a level of filtering and monitoring based on the first and second categories.

In contrast, the *EP Article* does not disclose setting a level of filtering and monitoring based on a category of information that is not based on appropriateness but consistent with a particular requirement of a group of users <u>and</u> based on a category of information based on appropriateness. The *MP Article* fails to remedy the deficiencies

of the *EP Article* because it too fails to disclose setting a level of filtering and monitoring based on two categories of information, where the first category is not based on appropriateness and consistent with a particular requirement of a group of users and the second category is based on appropriateness. Accordingly, claim 17 is not obvious in view of the *EP Article*, the *MP Article*, or a combination of the two.

The remaining pending claims are dependent upon either claim 2 or claim 17 and recite additional requirements. Thus, the remaining claims are also not obvious in view of the *EP Article*, the *MP Article*, or a combination of the two.

3.   Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, the pending claims are not obvious in view of the *EP Article*, the *MP Article*, or a combination of the two. As all outstanding issues have been addressed, Applicant respectfully requests favorable action by the Examiner and withdrawal of the cited rejections. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in an effort to discuss and resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP.

 /s Jeremy C. Whitley /
Jeremy C. Whitley
Registration No. 58,775
ip@nelsonmullins.com
1320 Main Street | Suite 1700
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Office: (803) 255-9764
Fax: (803) 255-9831